DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 057 SP 035 346

AUTHOR Hargreaves, Andy
TITLE Development and Desire: A Postmodern Perspective.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 51p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Activism; *Emotional Development; Ethics; Foreign Countries; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; *Moral Development; *Political Influences; Politics of Education; *Professional Development; Social Theories; *Teacher Education; *Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS *Postmodernism; Symbolic Interactionism

ABSTRACT

Three theoretical perspectives guide this discussion of teacher development: symbolic interactionism, critical social theory, and theories of postmodernity. Drawing on these perspectives, key dimensions of teacher development can be addressed. Good teaching involves competence in technical skills, but it also involves moral purpose; emotional investment (desire); and political awareness, adeptness, and acuity. The practice and research of teacher development should address all these dimensions, and what really matters is the interactions among and integration between them. Focusing on technical competence in isolation can make teacher development into a narrow, utilitarian exercise that does not question the purposes and parameters of what teachers do. Focusing on moral purpose and moral virtue alone can result in missionary fervor that is blind to the differences in values, competence, or working conditions among colleagues. Political strategies pursued in isolation can make teachers carping and hypercritical, falling into the trap of careerism and opportunism. Exclusive emphasis on emotional development can create teachers who are narcissistic and self-indulgent. Meeting the challenge of teacher development in the postmodern world requires attention to all these dimensions. (Contains approximately 170 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 372 057

DEVELOPMENT AND DESIRE:
A Postmodern Perspective

By

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Hargreaves

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Andy Hargreaves
Department of Educational Administration
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Paper presented at the
Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, April 1994

SP035346

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

It makes little sense to analyze, still less to prescribe forms of teacher development without first establishing what it is that needs to be developed; what teachers and teaching are for. My own position on teacher development is therefore closely associated with basic principles of what for me stands at the heart of teaching. This has roots in my own experiences of teachers and teaching, and reference points in particular theoretical traditions.

In part, my views of teacher development derive from my own experiences of teachers and teaching, my own "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975) as a student. Although research suggests that many teachers were good students, for whom schooling was a positive experience (Linblad & Pérez Prieto, 1992; Sugrue, 1993), my own experience as a working-class student in a selective, English grammar school was more distanced and marginal. For me, secondary school and everything it represented culturally with its didactic pedagogies, seemingly irrelevant curricula, religious assemblies, organized games and regimented uniforms was not an institution to embrace, but a place to socialize and an instrument for credentials and success (Hargreaves, 1989).

This school-based cultural marginality has created in me a strong impulse to reform, repair and make amends in education. When my school sent me a questionnaire about my future plans upon university graduation, I remember writing rather piously that I wished to enter teaching and eventually train a better generation of teachers than that which had taught me! Though modified and moderated in later years, this impulse to reform and repair still stays with me in my research and practice concerning teacher development. Teacher development for me is not just an item of detached intellectual curiosity, but also a focus of missionary purpose and passionate desire.

I have come to understand over time that the teachers who taught me were not personally unskilled or uncaring, but people of a particular time and place, shaped and constrained as much by the structures and traditions of secondary schooling as were their students. As Waller (1932) recognized, this

institutional life of schooling makes the teacher as much as it makes the student. It therefore became increasingly important for me to work with teachers from a standpoint of understanding rather than one of condemnation, and to do so with all kinds of teachers; not just enthusiastic innovators or exemplary teachers in exemplary schools but stalwarts, cynics and sceptics as well. By broadening the range of teachers with whom I work, to include even diffident and disagreeable ones, I have often been surprised. This has been good for my own learning and often confounded or created problems for claims about teacher development that prevailed in the literature. In this way, much of my understanding of teacher development has come from working with a wide range of ordinary and extraordinary teachers outside my own university setting. This, I think, has helped me understand many sorts of teachers and why they do what they do, with sympathy but without undue sentiment.

In theoretical terms, my position on teacher development is somewhat eclectic. The celebrated Canadian geologist, J. Tuzo Wilson, whose "brilliant theory" of continental drift "provided a unifying model for all of the large scale dynamics evident at the earth's surface", confessed before his death, to having "always been rather eclectic in my interests".[1] Eclecticism is often a thinly veiled term of abuse, implying inferior scholarship or lack of rigor. Paradigms are purity. Eclecticism is danger. As Wilson's example shows, though, eclecticism can sometimes forge creative connections across paradigms and push the boundaries of understanding further. Within my own eclectic orientation, three theoretical perspectives have become prominent:

1. ***Symbolic interactionism.*** This perspective helps clarify why teachers (and others) do what they do. It addresses practical realities rather than comparing people against prescriptive ideals or moral exhortations concerning human change and development. It does not condone people's actions, but certainly sets out to appreciate them (D. Hargreaves, 1978). Built upon the work of George Hebert Mead (1934) and developed extensively by Herbert Blumer (1969) and others, symbolic interactionism addresses how people's selves are formed and transformed through the meanings and

language (symbols) of human interaction (Woods, 1992). These socially constructed selves attach meanings to the contexts in which they work and act on the basis of them. In symbolic interactionism, teaching is more than a set of technically learnable skills: it is given meaning by teachers' evolving selves, within the realistic contexts and contingencies of their work environments.

Symbolic interactionism affords insights into teachers' *selves*, their meanings and purposes — ones which are frequently overlooked or overridden in reform efforts (Nias, 1989). It helps us see how less-than-perfect teacher actions are, in fact, rational, *strategic* responses to everyday, yet often overwhelming constraints in teachers' workplaces (Hargreaves, 1978; Woods, 1979). Symbolic interactionism also points to the importance of shared *cultures* of teaching, common beliefs and perceptions among sub-groups of teachers rooted in different subjects or sectors that develop in response to commonly faced problems, and provide ready made solutions and sources of learning for new entrants to the occupation (Hargreaves, 1986; D. Hargreaves, 1980; Lacey, 1977). Lastly, symbolic interactionism alerts us to patterned human differences among teachers in terms of such things as age and career stage (Becker, 1952; Sikes, Measor and Woods, 1985; Riseborough, 1981; Huberman, 1993); gender (Acker, 1992) and race (Troyna, 1993). Not all teachers respond to innovation, commit to collaboration, or construe the purposes of care in education, for instance, in quite the same way. Symbolic interactionism helps identify and explain these important differences. Symbolic interactionism, in short, helps us see teaching and teacher development as humanly constructed and constrained processes in all their imperfection and complexity.

2. ***Critical social theory.*** Symbolic interactionism tends to confine itself to the immediate settings of social interaction such as schools, classrooms, staffrooms and communities — ones that are clearly bounded in time and space. Yet there are worlds beyond these settings that we capture in aggregates and abstractions like states and economies, that powerfully shape the work of teaching, the aspirations that people hold for it and the conditions under which it can be accomplished. To understand the world of teaching properly,

we must therefore move to some extent beyond it. Some symbolic interactionists regard this macro theorizing as legitimate business, but one that is not theirs (Goffman, 1975; Woods, 1977). Other interactionists see such efforts at macro theorizing as unachievable; a futile pursuit of conceptual ghosts that have no substance in immediate interaction (Denzin, 1991, 1992).[2] Another discourse is therefore needed in which the macro-social influences on teacher development can be explored.

Little of the teacher development literature addresses macro level issues (but see Smyth, 1994). Research and writing on teaching more generally, however, has pointed to the societally generated constraints and dilemmas under which teachers work (McNeil, 1986), the ways in which teachers' work varies according to the social class communities and gender relations in which it is located (Connell, 1975; Metz, 1990), and the changing nature of the labor process in modern societies together with its implications for whether teachers' work, like the work of other semi-professionals (Larson, 1980), is becoming increasingly deskilled (Smyth, 1991; Apple, 1986).

Critical social theory is sensitive to the contexts of human interaction and the power relationships that comprise and surround it. It prompts us to consider the place of power, control, equity, justice, patriarchy, race, bureaucracy etc. in teaching and teacher development; to see teaching and teacher development as more than internal, institutional matters.

3. ***Theories of postmodernity.*** A third perspective addresses the *particular kinds* of contexts and changes which teachers and other people are encountering and experiencing at this specific moment in history. It adds a dynamic element to understanding the contexts of teacher development.

Theories of postmodernity point to the characteristics and consequences of what is coming to be called the postindustrial, postmodern age. In this period, old factory systems of mass production and consumption in an age of heavy manufacturing and standardized schooling systems that served it, are being replaced by flexible technologies in smaller units of enterprise (MacDonald, 1991; Harvey, 1989; Robertson, 1993). These flexible economies are calling for more flexible skills among future workforces, and

flexible patterns of teaching, learning and schooling through which such skills can be developed (Schlechty, 1990; Reich, 1992).

Organizationally, the need for flexibility and responsiveness is increasingly reflected in decentralized decision-making along with flatter decision-making structures, reduced specialization and blurring of roles and boundaries (Toffler, 1990; Leinberger & Tucker, 1991). In postmodern organizations, fixed rules and segregated roles are replaced by a focus on tasks and projects, utilizing whatever skills are collectively available for their completion (Kanter, Stein & Jick, 1992). Self-managing schools (Caldwell & Spinks, 1988; Smyth, 1993), and professional development networks (Lieberman & McLaughlin, 1992) are realizations of these emerging tendencies.

Culturally and politically, the postmodern age is witnessing a collapse of moral, political and scientific certainties. Advances in telecommunications along with more rapid dissemination of information are placing old ideological and scientific certainties in disrepute (Giddens, 1990; 1991). Patterns of migration and international travel are diversifying beliefs and multiplying voices in our culture. Old missions are collapsing, giving rise to struggles to build new ones — hence all the emphasis on mission and vision building in schools (Barth, 1990; Louis & Miles, 1990). With the decline of singular certainties, more voices are able to make themselves heard throughout the culture — the voices of women, visible minorities, the disabled, etc. — and our schools are becoming more politicized as a result (Elbaz, 1991; Goodson, 1992).

To understand teacher development at the turn of the millenium is to understand it in a peculiarly exhilarating and terrifying time of accelerating change, intense compression of time and space, cultural diversity, economic flexibility, technological complexity, organizational fluidity, moral and scientific uncertainty and national insecurity (Hargreaves, 1994). Only when we know what learning is for or what people think it is for can we know and imagine what teacher development might be for. This is why critical judgements about the social context of learning are so central to the teacher development agenda. What might that understanding look like? What,

drawing on the different traditions I have outlined, are some of the key dimensions of teacher development that we need to address and appreciate?

Dimensions

Good teaching, for most people, is a matter of teachers mastering the skills of teaching and the knowledge of what to teach and how to teach it. Teacher development, in this view, is about knowledge and skill development. This kind of teacher development is well known and widely practised. It can be neatly packaged in courses, materials, workshops and training programs.

Good teaching, however, also involves issues of moral purpose, emotional investment and political awareness, adeptness and acuity. What teacher development might mean in these terms is much less clear; not nearly so easy to package and plan. It touches on the teacher as a person, has relevance for teachers' long term orientations to their work, and impacts on the settings in which teachers teach. These moral, political and emotional aspects of teacher development are less well understood and less widely practised.

1. Technical Skill

It is obvious and uncontentious that good teaching requires competence in technical skills — be these ones of classroom management, mixed-ability teaching, cooperative learning, direct instruction, or whatever. Less obviously, but just as importantly, the possibilities for good teaching also increase when teachers command a wide repertoire of skills and strategies, and can judge how to select them for and adjust them to the child, the content and the moment (Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1988). How teachers (and indeed other professionals) make such judgements and make them well is more elusive (Schön, 1983) and not addressed at all effectively in most forms of teacher development.

Competence and skill rest, of course, on knowledge and understanding. In recent years, considerable efforts in teacher education and development have been devoted to creating and clarifying such a codified knowledge base

for teaching. Teachers, it is said, must know their subject matter — what it is they have to teach. They must have a knowledge base of pedagogy — the general principles and practices of how to teach. And they must also possess what Shulman (1986, 1987) calls *pedagogical content knowledge*: the principles and practices of teaching that accompany specific kinds of subject matter.

Defining teacher expertise in terms of a clear knowledge base, it has been argued, is central for effective teacher preparation (Burke, 1992); it offers a clear and calculable way of identifying, rewarding and promoting classroom teachers who have "advanced skills" (Ingvarrson, 1992); and it has been put forward as a way to define and defend a new codified basis for teacher professionalism (Labaree, 1992). Most teacher education and development initiatives rest on efforts of this kind to get teachers to improve their knowledge and skills of teaching and thereby also raise the status of the profession.

Success in knowledge and skill based endeavors in teacher development remains insufficient and elusive, however. When exposed to or trained in new knowledge and skills that might improve and expand their teaching, teachers often resist or reject them, select only the bits that suit them, or delay until other innovations supersede them. They reject knowledge and skill requirements

- when they are imposed. As McLaughlin (1990:15) notes, "we cannot mandate what matters to effective practice".
- when they are encountered in the context of multiple, contradictory and overwhelming innovations (Werner, 1988).
- when most teachers, other than those selected for design teams, have been excluded from their development (Fullan, 1991).
- when they are packaged in off-site courses or one-shot workshops, that are alien to the purposes and contexts of teachers' work (Little, 1993a).

- when teachers experience them alone and are afraid of being criticized by colleagues or of being seen as elevating themselves on self-appointed pedestals above them (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991).

Not surprisingly, the reason why knowledge about how to improve teaching is often not well utilized by teachers is not just that it is bad knowledge (though sometimes it is), or even badly communicated and disseminated knowledge. Rather, it does not acknowledge or address the personal identities and moral purposes of teachers, nor the cultures and contexts in which they work (Hultmann & Horberg, 1993). The false certainties of much knowledge and skill development are too inflexible for the practical complexities of the postmodern age. They reside in the preoccupations and obsessions of modern times with eliminating ambiguity, suppressing spontaneity, taming chaos and putting order in its place (Bauman, 1992:178). Clearly, there is and should be more, much more to teacher education and development than knowledge and skill development.

2. Moral Purpose

What do we find in teaching when we acknowledge that there is more to it than technique? What lies beyond expertise (Olson, 1991)? As Fenstermacher (1990) reflects and regrets, in debates about the knowledge base of teaching, "very little is heard about the fundamental purposes of teaching". (p.131) In particular, literature which analyzes and advocates professionalizatiion in teaching,

> is nearly devoid of talk about the moral nature of teaching, the moral duties and obligations of teachers, and the profound importance of teachers to the moral development of students. It is as if the moral dimensions of teachings were lost, forgotten about or.... simply taken for granted
>
> (p.132)

Teaching is inescapably a "moral craft" (Tom, 1987). It is "a profoundly moral activity" (Fenstermacher, 1990:133). Schoolteaching is moral, firstly, because it contributes to the creation and recreation of future generations

(Durkheim, 1961; Goodlad, 1990). In the societies of classrooms are the future societies of adults. By design or default, teachers cannot help but be involved in preparing these generations of the future. Children spend too many hours in their charge for them to escape this obligation.

Second, teaching is moral because of the small but significant judgements that teachers make in their innumerable interactions with children, parents and each other. As Goodlad (1990:30) puts it, "full recognition of teaching in schools as a profession depends on teachers, individually and collectively, demonstrating their awareness of and commitment to the burdens of judgement that go with a moral enterprise".

The moral character of teaching is most evident in the grand goals and missions that surround it. For instance, the proclamation of school effectiveness advocates, written into at least one major educational reform effort, that "all children can learn" is a moral as well as a technical statement.[3] It is moral by what it *includes* — the recognition that not some but *all* children can learn, and the attendant obligation for teachers to make that happen. Similarly, the statement is moral by what it *excludes*, for as Noddings (1992) retorts, the more important question is surely "all children can learn *what*?" In this respect, she argues, care is one of the most neglected purposes of schooling, too often sacrificed to the narrow cognitive goals that guide reform efforts.

The broad moral purposes of schooling and teaching are frequently implicit and unexamined; guided by comfort, convention, history and habit. As Pratt (1991) argues, though, in a society which is technologically complex, environmentally ravaged, culturally diverse and often socially unstable in its rapidly changing structures of family and community, these purposes and the subjects and learnings that flow from them are ripe for fundamental revision.

One of the central challenges to teachers in the postmodern age is that of working within contexts of pervasive moral uncertainty. Because of growing multicultural migration, international travel, global economies and reconstructed polities, the fundamental moral assumptions of the Judaeo-Christian tradition and common schooling upon which Western educational

systems have been based, are collapsing (Hargreaves, 1994). In the face of this moral collapse, some educators have sought to retreat to old moral certainties and restore "traditional" values in a singular way (Holmes, 1984). It is as well to remember, however, as Lasch (1991:82) notes, that such nostalgia for the past is "the abdication of memory". Indeed, he says, "nostalgia does not entail the exercise of memory at all, since the past it idealizes stands outside time, frozen in unchanging perfection" (p.83). Others have imposed such moralities legislatively in the form of culturally loaded National curricula which reinvent notions of national identity (Goodson, 1990; Hargreaves, 1989). But in many other cases, individual schools and systems are energetically trying to construct their own missions and visions together. Teacher and school development are, in this respect, closely related features of the changing moral contours of schooling.

Less spectacularly and transparently, the moral character of teaching is also to be found in the details of classroom learning and socialization; in the hidden as well as the official curriculum; in the everyday moral life of schools (Jackson, 1993). A teacher who treats "Genesis" as a myth and not a religious truth is making a moral decision. Children who are tested competitively or encouraged to work cooperatively are experiencing teachers' moral decisions. It is a moral decision when African American students are exposed to literature that collectively neglects their own cultural and literary heritage. Teachers make moral decisions when they determine whose answers should be solicited, whose voice should be heard, to whom help should be given, who should be punished, and for whom allowances should be made. Even teachers' interactions with their own colleagues — whether to assist the surly young teacher, whether to bail out yet again the one whose classes are causing havoc and whether to gingerly advise a senior colleague that they have treated one of their students unfairly or unkindly — these, too, are moral decisions.

Teachers may or may not have conscious moral intent in their work, but almost all of that work has consequences that are moral. There is no escaping this. Acknowledging these unavoidable moral dimensions of teaching has powerful implications for teacher education and development.

For some, it is a question of identifying and grappling with moral absolutes, however uncomfortable or inconvenient they might be. It is a matter of knowing and respecting the difference between right and wrong and adopting the right course with good conscience, whatever the consequences (Campbell, 1993).

In a postmodern world of immense cultural and religious diversity, however, such moral absolutes are almost impossible to pin down. Even if they could be established in principle, few, if any of teachers' moral decisions can be absolute or clear cut *in practice*. Moral principles may compete. Permitting maximum *freedom* of speech, for instance, may allow garrulous boys to override the *equal* speaking rights of more cautious and diffident girls. The pressing realities of classroom life, of managing large groups of diverse students, also prevent teachers from being perfectly virtuous with all their students. In large groups, the needs of some often have to be sacrificed to the needs of others. Care and attention are not infinite. Real teachers can never offer enough of these goods, or always distribute them evenly.

Attending to the moral dimensions of teaching usually involves distinguishing between better and worse courses of action, rather than right and wrong ones. There are no clear rules of thumb, no useful universal principles for deciding between these options. Unlike university philosophers of education, classroom teachers do not have the ethereal privilege of proclaiming their virtue from the high ground. They must live their moral lives in the swamp (Schön, 1983). This is particularly true in the postmodern age when the moral certainties grounded in tradition or science are collapsing and people are increasingly thrown back on their own reflective resources as a basis for moral judgement (Giddens, 1991). The considered moral life of teaching then becomes a matter of resolving multiple dilemmas (Berlak & Berlak, 1981), of making optimal moral decisions that are ethically defensible and practically workable within the teacher's particular contingencies of time and place. This is the best that teachers can do — and it is not easy.

Teacher development can help teachers articulate and rehearse resolving these moral dilemmas in their work. By reflecting on their own

practice, observing and analyzing other teachers' practice or studying case examples of practice, teachers can clarify the dilemmas they face and develop principled, practical and increasingly skillful and thoughtful ways of dealing with them (Groundwater-Smith, 1993). This approach to teacher development elevates the principles of thoughtful, practical judgement above personal prejudice, misleading moral absolutes, or the false certainties of science as a guide to action and improvement (Schön, 1983; Louden, 1991).

There are many ways for teachers to undertake such reflection and dilemma resolution

- alone but even better together, as they develop and discuss principles and approaches to practical problems whose solutions are uncertain and unclear.

- within their own schools where the situations being reflected upon are immediate and real, or in outside courses and teacher support groups where safe havens permit especially sensitive issues to be explored away from immediate colleagues (Oberg and Underwood, 1992).

- in informal discussion and dialogue, or in more structured and systematic forms of teacher-based inquiry.

Teacher development can also help create the conditions of work and cultures of collaboration in which teachers can develop, clarify, review, reflect on and redefine their purposes, missions and visions together. In discussion, as team partners or as peer coaches, colleagues can serve as mirrors for teachers to view their own practice. Teachers can also find or be offered "critical friends" who will talk to them, observe them, give them feedback, offer other perspectives, provide access to readings and research — all of which will help teachers probe more deeply and critically into the moral grounds and consequences of their classroom actions (Day, Whitaker & Johnston, 1990; Woods, 1993). Insider colleagues can do this. So can visiting researchers, consultants, teacher educators or other adults.

These are just some of the ways in which teacher development can help teachers move beyond addressing the techniques of teaching to embracing and evaluating its moral dimensions. But all that is not technical is more than merely moral. Beyond expertise, teacher development may need more than moral exhortation. Morality is not just a personal issue. It is also a political one — especially in a postmodern world where the boundaries between what is personal and what is political are becoming increasingly blurred (Denzin, 1992). The political aspects of teacher development must therefore also be attended to.

3. Political Awareness, Adeptness and Acuity

If moral philosophy attracts those who seek after virtue, politics often draws together those who suspect duplicity and vice. Political pursuits and concerns have often been seen as diametrically opposed to moral ones. Indeed politics is often regarded as immensely *immoral* in nature — shot through with artifice, self-interest, opportunism and corruption. Not surprisingly, therefore, those teachers who sometimes seem to care most for their children, whose classroom commitments seem most intense, are precisely the ones most likely to see educational politics as irrelevant to or even counterproductive for their own teaching. Art teachers often exemplify this pattern, for instance (Bennett, 1985). Politics for such teachers is about careerism, committee work or collective bargaining. Politics is tainted. Teaching is pure. Politics has no meaning or obvious benefits for their classroom work.

This common view of politics as organized politics is misleading, however. Politics is not specifically about organization and representation. It is about power in general. And power in education is everywhere. It is not extraneous to the classroom but always right there within it. Teachers exercise power over their students all the time. Most experience power being exercised over them by administrators. Many know equally well how to manipulate or manoevre around their principals (Blase, 1988).

When topics or project work are structured more around the interests of boys than girls, this is political (Delamont, 1980). When teachers support

practices of tracking that systematically consign Native students and African-American students to lower tracks, poorer instruction and lesser opportunities than their high track fellows, this is political (Oakes, 1992). When teachers in classrooms characterized by cultural diversity do not address the many distinctive learning styles of their students, this is political. It is political when teachers hustle and lobby for extra resources and attention that will benefit their students, and equally political when they refrain from doing so. When teachers give parents' voices no hearing or when students' classroom voices are silenced or suppressed, this is political too (Hargreaves, et al 1993).

Many seemingly moral judgements in education are therefore inescapably political. It is hard for many teachers and some educational writers and researchers to accept this. One example is Fullan's (1993) discussion of change forces in teacher education, where he places *moral purpose* at the centre of teacher preparation, while rejecting a more radical and explicitly politicized view of teacher education reform advanced by Liston and Zeichner (1991). Fullan (1993:110) summarizes Liston and Zeichner's "social reconstructionist" agenda where teacher educators are advised to be directly involved in teacher education programs, to engage in political work with colleges and universities, to support public school efforts to create more democratic learning and work environments, to engage in political work with professional associates and the like, and to work for social justice in other arenas (Liston & Zeichner, 1991:188). In response, Fullan doubts that these proposals "will fly".

> the fatal flaw is that taking on society is too ambitious. We cannot expect the vast majority of teachers and teacher educators to engage in political work, establish better democracies and reduce social injustices, even in their own bailiwicks... it is too daunting, too ambitious.
>
> (Fullan, 1993:110)

Neither Fullan nor Liston and Zeichner have got it quite right here. Both take a view of politics that is too narrow and specific. Liston and

Zeichner tie their perceptive comments about the need for greater political awareness and commitment among teachers to specific prescriptions that they should act on that awareness and commitment in organized, activist ways. This overlooks how teachers and teacher educators can act in many other politically legitimate ways — by promoting gender equity in their classrooms, socializing students in cooperative behaviors, creating and arguing for more critical social studies curricula, writing books and articles for newspapers, journals or teacher federation bulletins etc. Organized politics is not for every teacher. To demand that teachers get involved in particular kinds of political work is a morally offensive imposition upon some teachers' personal choices and may be practically unworkable in the context of many teachers' busy and demanding lives. Moreover, teachers can sometimes be drawn into organized union politics as a spoiling game, a way of seeking retribution against those responsible for their work deterioration (Carlson, 1990) when their hope of bringing about productive changes in their own classrooms has been lost.

Because politics extends beyond organized politics, Fullan's argument that most teachers cannot "take on society" (in organized, collective ways), misses the point that they are still *in* society and so are their students, who will become society's future generation. As we have seen, by what it addresses and avoids, teachers' everyday work inside and outside the classroom impacts profoundly upon the power relations embedded in that society of race, gender, justice, fairness, equity and so on. It is better that teachers address and reflect upon these political dimensions of their work explicitly, rather than acquiesce to unquestioned political purposes unconsciously and implicitly. Much of what is moral in teachers' work, therefore, is also political. It is essential for teachers to recognize this and act in thoughtful and purposeful ways with regard to the political contexts and consequences of their actions. What are some of the things that might be encompassed by this more politicized view of teacher development? What role can teacher development play beyond the the obvious domains of organized politics, unionism and committee work?

In general, being more political means being not merely reflective, but *critically* reflective about one's work; about the social conditions, contexts and consequences of one's teaching, as well as about one's skill, efficiency or kindliness in performing it (Louden, 1991; Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Liston & Zeichner, 1990; Pollard and Tann, 1988). Critical reflection can be undertaken alone or together with colleagues. It can be actively provoked by seeking out "critical friends" to offer searching, but supportive analyses of one's practice (Day, Whitaker & Johnston, 1990; Woods, 1993). Such critical reflection is an ongoing responsibility of teaching and teacher development, not something to be dealt with safely and sporadically in occasional assignments on award-bearing courses. Once this *stance* of critical reflection begins to be taken in teaching and teacher development, other actions and consequences flow from it.

First, being a more political and critically reflective teacher means learning about the micropolitical configurations of one's school. It means developing the capacity to discern who has formal and informal power, how this power is exercised, how resources are allocated, and how they can be secured beyond straight rational argument by influence, persuasion, assertiveness, diplomacy, trading favors, influencing power brokers, building coalitions, involving others, lobbying for support, planting seeds of an idea or proposal before presenting them in exhaustive detail, and so forth. Schools are micropolitical worlds as well as moral ones (Ball, 1987; Blase, 1991). To pursue one's moral purposes without reference to the micropolitical realities of schooling is to pursue them to the point of frustration, failure and futility. Very few proposals get accepted simply because they are a good idea! Moral martyrs, as Fullan (1993) terms them, might soldier on for a while aside from those political realities, but ultimately when they become burned out or embittered, they do little good for students or themselves.

Teachers who have been introduced to the micropolitics of schooling in relation to their own institutions can show breakthroughs in insight, action and effectiveness, which help them secure support and resources for their students (Goodson & Fliesser, 1992). This perspective should be a key component of teacher preparation and inservice development on-site, in

schools, where teachers can come to understand the micropolitical contours of their own workplaces, then take appropriate action as a result. Bringing together on-site teacher education and inservice development around political agendas and concerns as well the more customary moral and technical ones, remains one of the key and controversial challenges of school-based teacher education, teacher development and school improvement.

Second, being a more politically aware and developed teacher means empowering and assisting others to reach higher levels of competence and commitment. This is what Blase (1987) calls "positive politics". Student empowerment for instance can be fostered by creating more active and cooperative groupwork in classrooms, where students work not merely side-by-side *in* groups, but also collectively, together *as* groups (Alexander, 1992; Galton & Simon, 1980; Slavin, 1988). Teachers can also do more to explain upcoming innovations to students, and involve students actively in developing them (Rudduck, 1991). Additionally, students can be partners in as well as customary targets for assessment, through self-assessment, peer assessment, and periodic individual conferencing with their teachers (Hargreaves et al, 1993; Broadfoot et al, 1988). Asking teachers to empower students more thoroughly is partly a matter of moral exhortation and increased awareness. It is also a demand that teachers feel requires additional training — in one-to-one conferencing skills, for instance (Hargreaves et al, 1993).

Parent empowerment can be fostered by building partnerships with parents in implementing and developing innovations, rather than informing parents about them once teachers have made all the decisions (Swap, 1993). Elsewhere, Michael Fullan and I have argued for greater *interactive professionalism* among communities of teachers (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991). However, when this collaboration excludes parents and is confined to teachers alone, interactive professionalism runs the risk of becoming *incestuous professionalism*. Indeed, the language and discourse of teacher professionalism can be so specialized and self-enclosed as to exclude and alienate many parents. The "professionalism" of school reports, where teachers "communicate" with parents through guarded, "professionalized"

euphemisms (Woods, 1979), or through seemingly spontaneous anecdotal comments that are actually computer selections from pre-screened lists of safely coded statements — disempower parents and put them at a distance. For the risk and rewards of spontaneous and open parent-teacher communication, we have too often substituted safely simulated, overly "professionalized" versions of such communication that exclude rather than include; that serve to protect teachers, disempower parents and become a time-wasting world of their own. Honest, accessible and open communication with parents needs to be a higher priority in teacher development and school development. Teachers are trained extensively in how to communicate with children. They receive little or no training and inservice development in how to communicate with parents (Alexander, 1992).

Empowerment is a responsibility that teachers also owe their colleagues. I have written extensively about these issues elsewhere (Hargreaves, 1994; 1991; 1993; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991). What my own and other research on professional collaboration suggests is that teachers who work collaboratively rather than individually take more risks (Little, 1987), commit to continuous rather than episodic improvement (Rosenholtz, 1989), tend to be more caring with students and colleagues alike (Nias, 1989; Nias et al, 1989; Tafaaki, 1992), have stronger senses of teaching efficacy (Ashton & Webb, 1986), are more assertive in relation to external pressures and demands (Hargreaves, 1994), experience greater opportunities to learn and improve from one another (Woods, 1990), and have access to more feedback (Lortie, 1975) and opportunities for reflection (Grimmett & Crehan, 1991).

Teacher collaboration and shared leadership (Barth, 1990) is not a gift that should be awaited from administrators. It is something that teachers can and should also actively create themselves in ways that connect to and communicate with their colleagues. Constructing and participating in such professional communities (McLaughlin & Talbert, 1993; Little & McLaughlin, 1993) in schools is itself a vibrant form of teacher and school development that is built into rather than extraneous to the ongoing life of the school as a "learning organization" whose members are constantly searching for ways to

improve their practice (Senge, 1990; Fullan, 1993). Leadership can help by creating and sustaining the conditions in which teacher-led collaboration can flourish (Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, 1993; Corson, 1993), and by avoiding more superficial and administratively controlled forms of "imposed" or contrived collegiality (Hargreaves, 1991, 1994; Grimmett & Crehan, 1992). Placing and training beginning teachers within such positive cultures of collaboration and continuous improvement should also be a high priority in teacher education (Fullan, 1993:Ch. 6).

Third, being more political means acknowledging and embracing, not avoiding human conflict. One of the drawbacks of many teacher cultures, especially at the elementary levels is that their members are often inclined to move to early acquiescence and consensus (Nias, 1989; Pollard, 1987) rather than risk the hurt and disconnection that conflict and disagreement might bring. Yet, as Lieberman and her colleagues argue, conflict is a necessary part of the change and improvement process (Lieberman et al, 1991). Change threatens existing interests and identities and in larger schools in particular, the interests embedded in different subject departments, for instance, will often be competing (Siskin, 1993; Hargreaves et al, 1992; Ball, 1987). Indeed, if change does not involve conflict, the change being attempted is probably superficial; not threatening enough to be deep and significant (Louis & Miles, 1990).

The postmodern world increases possibilities for conflict because of greater cultural diversity, higher levels of moral uncertainty, flattened structures of decision-making and increasing attempts to hear and actively solicit the voices of different, dissonant and even dissident groups throughout social and organizational life. Conflict is a necessary, normal and perhaps even desirable feature of this complex and uncertain postmodern world. Indeed, within postmodernity, politics is less and less an issue of representative conflicts between large modernistic collectivities: between labor and capital, unions and employers, schools and states. Politics expresses itself more and more in particular issues and local contexts within decentralized systems. School based management is exemplifying and

heightening this tendency in education. In postmodern society, politics permeates every part of institutional life (Soja, 1989; Heller & Feher, 1988).

Teachers need to be prepared better to deal with personal and political conflicts in their work: not to avoid or even endure them but to embrace them as positive forces for change. Bringing differences into the open, being sensitive to one another's interests and positions, working for clarity and compromise, being encouraged to express feelings and frustrations, moving beyond initial and often inaccurate fears about one's threatened interests, expressing one's own voice and giving voice to others — all these are vital components of a productive and emancipatory process of continuous learning and improvement (Hargreaves et al, 1993). New and experienced teachers need to be trained in and prepared for these processes of conflict acceptance and resolution, for without them change will be superficial, missions and goals will be boring and bland, and the disagreements and resentments that always accompany improvement efforts will be driven underground and lead to frustration, martyrdom and intolerable guilt (Hargreaves & Tucker, 1991).

Fourth, for teacher developers themselves, being more political means recognizing that many typical training efforts in knowledge and skill development falsely treat the techniques in which teachers are being trained as universal, generic, neutral and equally applicable to all students irrespective of race, gender and other distinctions. Yet Robertson (1992) summarizes the research on gender differences in instruction to conclude that teachers distribute attention, praise and opportunities to contribute unequally between boys and girls. Even in seemingly learner-centred cooperative group projects, boys tend to be dominant. Yet, she notes, efforts at improving instruction tend to be treated as "gender-neutral".

Staff developers need to be more sensitive to how patterns of instruction and teachers' training in them impact upon students differently according to gender, race and so on. Race and gender differences have tended to be invisible or in the background of instructional improvement efforts. It is time to bring them to the fore.

Fifthly, to return to Liston & Zeichner's (1991) agenda, it *is* also important to be reflective about the long term political and social consequences of one's classroom work, to develop a principled (though not necessarily pious) stand in relation to them, to build active support for the principles embodied in that stand and to defend one's classroom ground, one's workplace culture, and one's whole profession against political and administrative assaults and intrusions upon those principles. This too, is an important priority for teacher development. Although many teacher developers may be afraid to rock this particular boat, in their hearts, beneath the comforts of expediency, perhaps they really should.

Olson (1991) rightly urges us to move "beyond expertise" in our approaches to teacher development. But what this section makes clear is that we must move beyond his and others' exhortations to personal moral virtue as well. Like it or not, teacher development *is* a political activity, especially so in the emerging postmodern world. Building more awareness, adeptness and acuity among teachers so they can pursue positive politics inside and beyond their schools for the benefit of their students, must therefore become a much more salient and explicit part of the teacher development agenda.

4. Emotional Involvement

Reflection, I have argued, is central to teacher development. Teachers should reflect on their technical effectiveness, moral purposes and political conditions and consequences of their work. But the mirror of reflection does not capture all there is to see in a teacher. It tends to miss what lies deep inside teachers; what motivates them most about their work. However, conscientiously it is done, the reflective glance can never quite get to the emotional heart of teaching.

Beyond technique and moral purpose what makes good teaching is *desire*. According to the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, desire* is "that emotion which is directed to the attainment or possession of some object from which pleasure or satisfaction is expected; longing, craving, a wish". Desire is imbued with "creative unpredictability" (Lasch, 1990;66) and "flows of energy (Deleuze & Guattari, 1977:2). In desire is to be found the creativity

and spontaneity that connects teachers emotionally and sensually (in the literal sense of feeling) to their children, their colleagues and their work. Such desires among particularly creative teachers are for fulfilment, intense achievement, senses of breakthrough, closeness to fellow humans, even love for them (Woods, 1990; Nias, 1989). Without desire, teaching becomes arid and empty. It loses its meaning. Understanding the emotional life of teachers, their feelings for and in their work, and attending to this emotional life in ways that positively cultivate it and avoid negatively damaging it, should be absolutely central to teacher development efforts.

Yet most teacher development initiatives, even the most innovative ones, neglect the emotions of teaching. The whole push towards creating more reflective practice tends to do this in rational, calculative, cognitive, ways. Reflective practice is presented as being about thinking, analyzing and inquiring, not about feeling, intuiting and engaging (e.g. Zeichner, 1991). Indeed, Liston and Zeichner (1990:239-240) argue for the importance of "rational deliberation" and "giving of good reasons" when teachers reflect on moral value claims, rather than resorting to the "doctrine" of "emotivism" and its claim that all moral judgements are nothing but expressions of preference, attitude or feeling.[4]

Action research, even critical action research, has been criticized for similar reasons. While often predicated on the pursuit of *dispassionate* inquiry, Chisholm (1990:253) argues that action research should instead reject "deceptive rational coolness in favour of explicit commitment... in favour of passionate scholarship" (also Dadds, 1991). Dadds (1993:294) points out that in one action-research relationship she examined, "far from the experience being initially, coolly cerebral and analytical for the researcher, it is emotive, disturbing and judgemental". Thus, action research that does not attend to the feelings of teachers and to creating situations of safety and security in which observation, inquiry and criticism can take place, may actually reverse or retard teacher development, by making teachers vulnerable, exposed and even ashamed about what transpires (Dadds, 1991:298).

Similarly, in the education and induction of new teachers, while the strains of becoming a new teacher are often viewed as ones of competence,

mastery, developing routines, building a repertoire, establishing a reputation, and so on, Tickle (1991:320) has found, in a study of beginning teachers that "learning how to handle the emotional responses was... as important as learning how to conduct tasks, meet new experiences, make judgements, build relationships, or assimilate new knowledge". For Tickle, these emotional aspects of the beginning teacher's self are inextricably linked to acquiring and using classroom techniques and to applying professional judgement.

Outside the classroom, in the domain of teachers' relations with their colleagues, there has been a tendency among researchers to value forms of collaboration that are more intellectual, inquiry-based and task-centred over ones which are organized more informally around principles and purposes of care and connection. Little (1990), for example, has developed a continuum of collegiality that distinguishes strong from weak ties among teachers. She describes scanning and storytelling, help and assistance and sharing as relatively weak forms of collegiality. She argues that if collaboration is limited to anecdotes, help giving only when asked or to pooling of existing ideas without examining or extending them, it can simply confirm the *status quo*. *Joint work*, however, represents a stronger, more "robust" form of collaboration. In the form of team teaching, collaborative planning, action research, peer-coaching etc., it implies and creates stronger interdependence, shared responsibility, collective commitment to improvement, and greater readiness to participate in review and critique.

In a critique of Little's work, Taafaki (1993) has argued that her conception of joint work is limited. Drawing on literature on women's ways of knowing (e.g. Belenky et al, 1986) she argues that joint work:

> connotes a valuing of the predominant patriarchial and masculine structure which places emphasis and value on work and its products rather than by seeking a balance with affiliations based on care and concern for the well being of others.
>
> (Taafaki, 1993:102)

Taafaki shows that in their exchange of narratives and stories, teachers are not merely "gossiping" for amusement or moral support. They are learning about the moral principles which guide each other's work and that if sufficiently shared, might provide a basis for further associations among them. These "communal caring" cultures are most likely to be found in the feminine, feminized, though not necessarily feminist world of elementary teaching (Acker, 1993). Such cultures may not operate like rational seminars of rigorous intellectual inquiry, but alongside and within the practices of care and connection, they do incorporate inquiry and reflection in more implicit, informal and incidental ways.

Much of the writing on and practice of teacher development has tended to emphasize its rational, intellectual, cognitive, deliberative and strategic qualities. Even those views of teacher development that have paid attention to teachers' emotions and selves have tended to rationalize and intellectualize their treatment in calculative, managerial ways. The self is regarded as something to be "managed" (Woods, 1981), interests are things to be "juggled" (Pollard, 1982), personal and professional growth are things to be "planned" (Day, 1993). Selves, like actions and careers, it seems are subject to strategic definition and redefinition (Woods, 1983; Nias, 1989). Yet as Crow (1989) points out, not all social actions can be usefully construed in terms of strategies. Some actions are spontaneous or traditional in nature. Commenting on conceptualizations of teachers' careers, Evetts (1994:16) argues that

> For many individuals, but particularly women, career actions would fit more appropriately into a category of traditional action since career decisions illustrate reference to the past, continuity and lack of calculation, rather than the instrumentality and rationality that are implied by the term strategy.

Indeed, Evetts concludes, "it might be the case that strategy, like career, is a gendered concept" (p. 17).

In short, whether they are supportive or critical of existing systems, the dominant paradigms of teacher development research and practice tend to be

rational, calculative, managerial and somewhat masculine in nature. The professorial values of rational debate and analysis in the seminar room are imposed upon the pedagogical practices of intuition and improvisation in the classroom.[5] The turbulence, excitement and unpredictability of teachers' emotions are either ignored in much teacher development work or reinscribed within rational frameworks where they can be planned and managed in dispassionate ways.

Exploring the emotions is the exception in teacher development (Saltzburger-Wittenburg et al., 1983 for one such exception). But even where the affective aspects of teaching *are* acknowledged and encouraged, only certain emotions are made visible or portrayed as positive, while others are portrayed negatively, or omitted altogether. What matters here is not that teachers' emotions are represented in evaluative ways, but that these representations are asserted or assumed rather than argued through in considered and explicit detail. Implicitly, the discourse of teacher development has come to value particular forms of emotional being among teachers, and to disvalue others. Jennifer Nias' important work, which has done more than almost any other to bring emotions and the self to the forefront of teacher development, nonetheless reveals patterns of preference towards particular kinds of emotional expression and development among teachers. In her book on primary teachers, for example Nias (1989:194) argues that

> the warmth, patience, strength and calm required by tradition and circumstances cannot eradicate teachers' fiercer and more negative emotions: for teaching is, in Connell's words an 'emotionally dangerous occupation" (Connell, 1985:121).... For example, Jackson (1968:139-141) gives a sensitive and insightful account of American elementary teachers' 'love' and 'respect' for their pupils. The intensity of such emotions is balanced by anger... and by the shame which accompanies the uncontrolled expression of this rage.

Towards the end of her book, Nias concludes that

> Although much of this book focuses on teachers' socially regulated 'selves', their own descriptions of their feelings about pupils, and their relationships with them and with their colleagues, reminds us that the regressive, passionate and unruly aspects of human nature are always present in the classroom and may sometimes escape from rational control.
>
> (p. 203)

In Nias' writing and elsewhere, there is a tendency, when the emotions of teaching are acknowledged, to rate them on a seemingly singular scale of desirability and appropriateness. Carefully regulated and tempered emotions like warmth, patience, strength, calm, caring, concern, building trust and expressing vulnerability, are preferred and privileged over anger, rage, passion and sometimes even love; over emotions which are portrayed as fiercer, more negative, intensive, regressive and unruly in nature.

Emotional states, though, are not simply positive or negative, good or bad, in some universal sense. They can only be evaluated *in context*. Anger, for instance can be surprisingly positive in some contexts, even educational ones, as in the North American Native Indian Medicine Way Path of Learning's positive valuation of "anger at injustice" as something worth developing among one's students.[6] This program also values "noble passions" among its desirable outcomes. Emotions and their legitimate expression that is, are *culturally loaded*. Particular emotions and their expression are accorded different value within different cultural, racial and ethnic groups.

Emotions are also *socially coded*. They help regulate the basic patterns of human interaction within social groups. There are different "strokes" for different folks, so to speak. Patterns of interaction in different social groups are regulated by emotional codes, by particular forms of emotional expression distinctive to those groups. Moreover, these differences in emotional expression are not merely random or accidental. They often vary with the status positions of social groups. As social groups have different statuses, so

do the emotions that can be legitimately expressed and that regulate the conduct within them. As Montandon (1992:17) puts it:

> We can hypothesize ... that the implementation of this emotional socialization varies between social group, culture and historical period, just as it varies along the type of functioning of the educational instances.[7]

Which emotions and their expressions are valued, therefore, seems to be linked to the status of social groups and their position in the social or occupational structure — just as regulatory codes of language and cognition (styles of speaking and thinking) differ between those groups (Collins, 1990; Gordon, 1990). In studies of language codes among different social classes, for instance, white, middle-class standard speech which is indirect, abstract, planned, considered, impersonal and qualified is often valued and treated as legitimate in comparison to non-white, working-class, non-standard speech which is more direct, concrete, personal and spontaneous (e.g. Bernstein, 1973; Dittmar, 1976). There are hints of similar distinctions in Nias' (1989) depiction of teachers' emotional states — controlled and carefully regulated forms of emotional expression being preferred to more spontaneous, impassioned, volatile ones. Yet intense human emotions and passions are often at the very heart of teacher commitment and desire. Accepting and even accentuating these kinds of emotion in teaching; moving beyond the emotional codes of polite society to codes that embrace the vigour and vitality of working class inheritance, Mediterranean or Latin American cultural styles or African American forms of experience, for instance, remains an important challenge for practice and research in teacher development. The accepted emotional codes of teaching, that is should be able to be accommodated as easily in Mediterranean Catalonia as in rural English Cambridgeshire or the suburbs of Southern California; in the urban excitement of New York City as much as in the leafy middle class enclaves of New York State. It is important, in this respect, that teacher developers do not merely care for and cultivate the emotional lives of teachers, but that they do so in ways that extend beyond white, middle-class norms of quiet caring and cultural politeness.

Reason and purposive rationality have enjoyed preeminence for centuries. In the postmodern age, this preeminence is drawing to a close. Purposive rationality was integral to the modern age and its concern with control, regulation, ordering and centralization of power on the one hand; or the pursuit of emancipation through intellectual enlightenment and application of scientific knowledge on the other (Bauman, 1992). The uncertainties, complexities and rapid change of the postmodern age, along with growing awareness of the perverted realizations of science in war, weaponry and environmental disaster, have brought about disillusionment with this purposive rationality (Saul, 1992). Practical rationality (Toulmin, 1990), practical reasoning (Schwab, 1971) and personal knowledge (Polanyi, 1958) have been brought out of the shadows cast by purposive rationality. The pride of place occupied by purposive rationality among all other forms of rationality, which have tended to be viewed as lesser or derivative versions of it, has been questioned. Max Weber (1947:88) who wrote extensively and influentially on the nature of rational action, argued that

> For the purposes of a typological scientific analysis, it is convenient to treat all irrational, affectually determined elements of behavior as factors of deviation from a conceptually pure type of rational action.

However, away from the world of ideal categorization, in reality, when it is compared to the pervasive presence of creative action, traditional action, and the like, purposive rationality is actually something of a minority form in our culture (Joas, 1993). In the postmodern world, multiple rather than singular forms of intelligence are coming to be recognized (Gardner, 1983); multiple rather than singular forms of representation of students' work are being advocated and accepted (Eisner, 1993). Many ways of knowing, thinking and being moral; not just rational, "logical" ones, are coming to be seen as legitimate, not least the knowledge and moral judgement of women (Belenky et al, 1986; Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1984).

Postmodernity is pressing us to accept complexity, diversity and uncertainty as central to our professional and personal lives. In an increasingly post-rational society, emotions that cannot easily be managed,

regulated, planned or controlled will become increasingly prominent and problematic features of our workplaces . In one sense, passion, desire and other intense emotions have always been central to teaching. But governments, bureaucracies and even professional developers have ignored them, driven them underground, or sought to tame and regulate them in pursuit of the technical efficiency, planned change and rational reform that has characterized the modern mission. As a result, care has been cast aside when busy teachers coping with multiple innovations have no longer been able to give it (Neufeld, 1991; Apple & Junck, 1992). Joy has been planned away by meetings, mandates and school development or professional growth plans (Hargreaves, 1991). Anxiety, frustration and guilt have become widespread consequences; burnout and cynicism their legacies to the classroom (Hargreaves & Tucker, 1991). Emotions are pivotal to the quality of teaching. Teacher developers ignore them at their peril.

Emotional awareness and emotional growth in teaching can be fostered and sustained through specific techniques such as personal reflective journals, shared discussions of personal and professional life histories, or establishment of teacher support groups, for example. More generally, the development of collaborative school cultures has been shown to create environments in which successes can be shared, vulnerabilities aired, differences acknowledged and trust and tolerance consolidated (Nias et al, 1989; Nias et al, 1992; Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991). This points once more to the greater benefits of attending to the ongoing cultures and conditions of teachers' work as environments for positive, continuous development compared to advocating or adopting specific programs and techniques.

Purposive rationality and reasoned reflection are not irrelevant to teaching or indeed to other parts of our lives. Indeed, they remain extremely important as sources of technical, moral and political deliberation. But they must be placed in proper perspective. Problem-solving, reflection and rational discussion are not hierarchically or developmentally superior or preferable to care, connection and emotional engagement. There is a need for greater equity, integration and balance between the two. This remains a real and unrealized challenge for teacher development work.

Conclusions

The practice and research of teacher development, I have argued, should address the technical competence of teaching, the place of moral purpose in teaching, political awareness, acuity and adeptness among teachers, and teachers' emotional attachments to and engagement with their work. None of these dimensions alone capture all that is important or all there is to know about teacher development. What really matters is the interactions among and integration between them.

Focusing on technical competence in isolation can make teacher development into a narrow, utilitarian exercise that does not question the purposes and parameters of what teachers do. It can lead to misleading treatments of new teaching strategies as politically and ideologically uncontroversial or as generically applicable to all students irrespective of differences in race or gender, for instance. Induction in new techniques can be stressed while teachers' principled disagreement with them is suppressed. All the glitziness of stage-managed workshop presentations, all the "bells and whistles" in the world, are no substitute for the openness and rigor of this moral and political questioning. More dangerously, such workshops may even seduce teachers into sidestepping such questioning (Hargreaves & Dawe, 1990). Even when new techniques have demonstrable merit, training in them may be ineffective when it does not address the real conditions of teachers' work, the multiple and contradictory demands to which teachers must respond, the cultures of teachers' workplaces which may or may not encourage risk and experimentation, and teachers' emotional relationships to their teaching, their children and to change in general.

Focusing on moral purpose and moral virtue alone also has its limitations. Teachers and teacher developers who do this can become pious and grandiose in their pursuit of moral virtue. In positions of teacher leadership, their missionary fervor can blind them to the differences in values, competence, working conditions or levels of emotional security among their colleagues. Such leaders have the visions. Their colleagues are merely expected to share them! By comparison, when their positions are more marginalized within the school, teachers motivated by a singular moral

purpose, however laudable it is, can become moral martyrs, isolated in enclaves of sacrificial self-righteousness. Stigmatized teachers of stigmatized students — teachers of special education, or of low-status practical subjects, for instance — are particularly vulnerable to this syndrome. It is almost impossible for moral martyrs to influence the colleagues who reject them, and in their increasing isolation, it becomes more and more likely that they will suffer from burnout or cynicism as a result (Burgess, 1984; Little, 1993b).

Political strategies pursued in isolation raise different problems. In the absence of sensitivity to the emotional needs of others, they can make teachers carping and hypercritical. Teachers of this kind can monopolize endless staff meetings and consume vast quantities of office paper for memoranda that ritually oppose any and all proposals for change. Without sincere moral purpose that is connected to the well-being of students, even those politicized teachers who superficially embrace positive change can also fall into the trap of careerism and opportunism, playing school politics mainly to feather their own nests.

Finally, problems can arise if exclusive emphasis is placed on the emotions of teacher development. Approaching teacher development predominantly or exclusively as a process of self development can create real difficulties when moral frameworks or senses of context are weak. Under these conditions, teacher development can become disturbingly narcissistic and self-indulgent. Without clear senses of context, of political and practical realism, teachers' selves can become narcissistic, *boundless* selves (Hargreaves, 1994), that see no boundaries between themselves and the world beyond them. These boundless selves know no limits to the power of personal change. They have no sense of the contexts and conditions which currently limit what most individual teachers can reasonably achieve and which teachers and others must confront together if more than trivial improvements are to be made. The rhetoric of personal change is one of human empowerment. However, in times when the contours and conditions of teachers are being massively restructured all around them, retreating to an enclosed world of the personal and the practical, withdrawing

exclusively into stories of the self, creates exactly the opposite effect: of political quiescence and professional disempowerment.

So while they are analytically separate, the different dimensions of teacher development must in practice be addressed together. If desire is a pivotal point of focus here, it can be properly stimulated and supported only through the holistic integration of all the dimensions of teacher development. Quick shots of desire can be administered through single workshops, but their benefits are rarely permanent. If passion and desire are to be stimulated and supported among many teachers over long periods of time, they must be attended to in the ongoing conditions and cultures of teachers' working lives. Increasing competence and mastery both fuels and is fuelled by teacher desire. Moral purpose gives a focus to desire; can channel it in worthwhile directions. Political action and awareness can help combat the conditions of isolation, poor leadership, imposed and escalating demands, narrow visions and disheartening working conditions that can otherwise dampen teachers' desire. Creative collaborative environments of continuous learning and working with "critical friends" can enhance this project of resistance and reconstruction even further.

What we want for our children we should also want for their teachers: that schools be places of learning for both of them, and that such learning be suffused with excitement, engagement, passion, challenge, creativity and joy. Meeting such goals is not only a challenge for teacher development, but also fundamentally a challenge to our beliefs about and commitments to the kinds of schools and education we want in the postmodern world. The issue for those of us who care about teaching and teacher development is whether technically, morally, politically and emotionally, we are up to that broader challenge.

Notes

1. See the obituary to J. Tuzo Wilson in "Celebrated Geologist, J. Tuzo Wilson, 84", Toronto Star, 17th April, 1993, p. 16.

2. My own refutation of this attempt to deny the possibility or relevance of macro-theorizing is argued in detail in Hargreaves (1985).

3. The reform effort concerned is the Kentucky State Education Reform Act.

4. Close inspection of Liston & Zeichner's text reveals deceptiveness in the discourse through which they compare emotivism and rational deliberation. Emotivism is characterized as invoking *"nothing but"* expressions of preference, attitude or feeling. By contrast, *"it is possible"* for rational deliberation over value claims to occur (my emphases). Liston & Zeichner thereby rhetorically dismiss the emotions by rejecting an exaggerated position where moral judgement involves *nothing but* emotions. The more reasonable partial claim that *it is possible* for rational deliberation to occur then becomes the total, and only claim. The discourse thereby elevates rational deliberation above the emotions in teacher reflection, and the possibility of an integrated, balanced rapprochment between thinking and feeling, cognition and emotion, is discursively dismissed.

5. It is important to acknowledge here that ironically, professorial culture outside the seminar room, in other parts of the workplace, often operates on very different principles than those that are valued within it.

6. The Medicine Way Path of Learning as a guide for curriculum planning is produced by and available from Children of the Earth Secondary School, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

7. Translated from the French. The original translation reads:

> "On peut faire l'hypothése d'ores et déjà que la mise en oeuvre de cette socialisation emotionelle varie selon les groupes sociaux, selon les cultures, selon les periodes historiques, tout comme elle varie selon le type de fonctiennement des instances éducatives."

References

Acker, S. (1992). Creating careers: Women teachers at work. *Curriculum Inquiry*, **22**(2), 141-163.

Acker, S. (1993). *Women teachers working together*, Unpublished paper. Toronto: Department of Sociology in Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Alexander, R. (1992). *Policy and Practice in Primary Education*. London: Routledge.

Apple, M. & Jungck, S. (1992). You don't have to be a teacher to teach this unit: Teaching, technology and control in the classroom. In Hargreaves, A. & Fullan, M. (Eds.), *Understanding Teacher Development*. London: Cassell and New York: Teachers College Press.

Apple, M. (1986). *Teachers and Texts*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ashton, P. & Webb, R. (1986). *Making a Difference: Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and Student Achievement*. New York: Longman.

Ball, S. (1987). *Micropolitics of the School*. London: Methuen.

Barth, R. (1990). *Improving Schools from Within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bauman, Z. (1992). *Intimations of Postmodernity*. London and New York: Routledge.

Becker, H. (1952). The career of the Chicago public school-teacher. *American Journal of Sociology*, **57**, 470-477.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R. & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's Ways of Knowing*. New York: Basic Books.

Bennett, C. (1985). Paints, pots or promotion?: Art teachers' attitudes towards their careers. In Ball, S. and Goodson, I. (Eds.), *Teachers' Lives and Careers*. New York: Falmer Press.

Berlak, H. & Berlak, A. (1981). *Dilemmas of Schooling: Teaching and Social Change*. London: Methuen.

Bernstein, B. (1973). *Class, Codes and Control*. Vol. I. London: Paladin.

Blase, J. (Ed.) (1991). *The Politics of Life in Schools*. New York: Corwin Press.

Blase, J. (1988). The teachers' political orientation vis-a-vis the principal: The micropolitics of the school. *Politics of Education Association Yearbook*. New York: Taylor-Francis Ltd., 113-126.

Blase, J. (1987). Political interactions among teachers: Sociocultural context in the schools. *Urban Education*, **22**(3), 286-309.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interactionism*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Broadfoot, P., James, M., McMecking, S., Nuttall, D. & Stierer, B. (1988). *Records of Achievement: Report of the National Evaluation of Pilot Schemes*. London: HMSO.

Burgess, R. (1984). It's not a proper subject: It's just Newsom. In Goodson, I. and Ball, S. (Eds.), *Defining the Curriculum*. Lewes: Falmer Press.

Burke, A. (1992). *Teaching: Retrospect and Prospect*. The Stationery Office, Dublin: Brunswick Press.

Caldwell, B. and Spinks, J. (1988). *The Self-Managing School*. London and New York: Falmer Press.

Campbell, E. (Forthcoming, 1993). Raising the moral dimension of school leadership. *Curriculum Inquiry*.

Carlson, D. (1992). *Teachers and Crisis: Urban School Reform and Teachers' Work Culture.* New York: Routledge.

Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming Critical: Education, Knowledge and Action Research.* London and New York: Falmer Press.

Chisolm, L. (1990). Action research: Some methodological and political considerations. *British Educational Research Journal,* **16**(3).

Collins, R. (1990). Stratification, emotional energy and transient emotions. In Kemper, T. (Ed.), *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions.* New York: The University of New York Press, 27-57.

Connell, R. (1985). *Teachers' Work.* Sydney and New York: George Allen and Unwin.

Corson, D. (1993). *Critical Policy Making: Emancipatory School-Site Governance in Multi-Ethnic Schools.* Paper presented at the International Conference on Democracy and Education in Multicultural Societies, The Adam Foundation for Peace, Jerusalem, June.

Crow, G. (1989). The use of the concept of strategy in recent sociological literature. *Sociology,* 23(1), 1-24.

Dadds, M. (1993). The feeling of thinking in professional self-study. *Educational Action Research,* **1**(2), 287-303.

Dadds, M. (1991). *Passionate Inquiry: The Role Of The Self In Teacher Action Research.* Paper presented to the Classroom Action Research Network Conference, April.

Darling-Hammond, L. and Berry, B. (1988). *Evolution of Teacher Policy,* Washington, D.C.: Center for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University and The Rand Corporation.

Day, C. (1993). *Personal Development Planning: Towards A Lifelong Development Model Of Teacher Growth.* Paper presented to the second Professional Actions and Cultures of Teaching (PACT) conference., London, Canada, Spencer Hall, September 26-27.

Day, C., Whitaker, P. & Johnston, D. (1990). *Managing Primary Schools in the 1990s: A Professional Development Approach.* London: Paul Chapman Ltd.

Delamont, S. (1980). *Sex Roles and the School.* London: Methuen.

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1977). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* New York: Viking Press.

Denzin, N. (1992). *Symbolic Interactionism and Cultural Studies.* Oxford, U.K. and Cambridge, U.S.A.: Blackwell.

Denzin, N. (1991). *Images of Postmodern Society.* London and Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Dittmar, N. (1976). *Sociolinguistics.* London: Arnold.

Durkheim, E. (1961). *Moral Education.* New York: Free Press.

Eisner, E. (1993). Forms of understanding and the future of educational research. *Educational Researcher,* **22**(7), 5-11.

Elbaz, F. (1991). Research on teachers' knowledge. *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* **23**(1).

Evetts, J. (1994). *Becoming a Secondary School Headteacher.* London: Cassell.

Fenstermacher, G. (1990). Some moral considerations on teaching as a profession. In Goodlad, J., Soder, R. and Sirotnik, K. (Eds.), *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 130-151.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform.* London and New York: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The New Meaning of Educational Change.* New York: Teachers' College Press, Toronto: OISE Press and London: Cassell.

Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1991). *What's Worth Fighting For?: Working Together for Your School.* Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers Federation, Massachusetts: The Network, North East Laboratory, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, and Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Administration.

Galton, M. and Simon, B. (Eds.). (1980). *Progress and Performance in the Primary Classroom.* London: Routledge.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences.* New York: Basic Books.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self Identity.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goffman, E. (1975). *Frame Analysis.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Goodlad, J. (1990). The occupation of teaching in schools. In Goodlad, J., Soder, R. and Sirotnik, K. (Eds.), *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodson, I. (1992). Sponsoring the teacher's voice. In Hargreaves, A. and Fullan, M. (Eds.), *Understanding Teacher Development.* London: Cassell and New York: Teachers' College Press.

Goodson, I. (1990). Nations at risk and national curriculum: Ideology and identity. In *Politics of Education Association Yearbook*. New York: Taylor and Francis Ltd., 219-252.

Goodson, I. & Fiesser, C. (1992). Exchanging gifts: Collaborative research and theories of context. In Goodson, I. and Mangan, M. (Eds.), *History, Context and Qualitative Methods in the Study of Education*, RUCCUS, Occasional Papers, Vol. 3, Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario.

Gordon, S. L. (1990). Social structural effects on emotions. In Kemper, T. (Ed.), *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*. New York: The University of New York Press, 145-179.

Grimmett, P. and Crehan, P. (1991). The nature of collegiality in teacher development: The case of clinical supervision. In Fullan, M. and Hargreaves, A. (Eds.), *Teacher Development and Educational Change*. London and New York: Falmer Press.

Groundwater-Smith, S. (1993). *Introducing Dilemmas Into The Practicum Curriculum*. Paper presented to the 5th National Practicum Conference, Macquarie University, Sydney, 2nd-6th February.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing Teachers, Changing Times: Teachers' Work and Culture in the Postmodern Age*. London: Cassell, New York: Teachers' College Press and Toronto: OISE Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1993). Individualism and individuality: Reinterpreting the teacher culture. In Little, J. W. & McLaughlin, M. (Eds.), *Teachers' Work: Individuals, Colleagues and Contexts*. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1991). Contrived collegiality: The micropolitics of teacher collaboration. In Blase, J. (Ed.), *The Politics of Life in Schools.* New York: Corwin Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1989). *Curriculum and Assessment Reform.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press and Toronto: OISE Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1986). *Two Cultures of Schooling.* London and New York: Falmer Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1985). The micro-macro problem in the sociology of education. In Burgess, R. (Ed.), *Issues in Educational Research.* London and New York: Falmer Press, 21-47.

Hargreaves, A. (1978). The significance of classroom coping strategies. In Barton, L. and Meighan, R. (Eds.), *Sociological Interpretations of Schooling and Classrooms: A Reappraisal.* Driffield, England: Nafferton Books.

Hargreaves, A., Davis, J., Fullan, M., Wignall, R., Stager, M. & Macmillan, R. (1992). *Secondary School Work Cultures and Educational Change.* Final report of a project funded by the Ontario Ministry of Education Transfer Grant. Toronto: Department of Educational Administration, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Hargreaves, A. & Dawe, R. (1990). Paths of professional development: Contrived collegiality, collaborative culture and the case of peer coaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 4(2).

Hargreaves, A. & Tucker, E. (1991). Teaching and guilt: Exploring the feelings of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 7(5/6), 491-505.

Hargreaves, A., Leithwood, K., Gerin-Lajoié, D., Cousins, B. L. and Thiessen, D. (1993). *Years of Transition: Times for Change.* Final report of a

project funded by the Ontario Ministry of Education. Toronto: Queen's Printer.

Hargreaves, D. (1978). Whatever happened to symbolic interactionism? In Barton, L. and Meighan, R. (Eds.), *Sociological Interpretations of Schooling and Classrooms: A Reappraisal*. Driffield, England: Nafferton Books.

Hargreaves, D. (1980). The occupational culture of teaching. In Woods, P. (Ed.), *Teacher Strategies*. London: Croom Helm.

Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heller, A. & Fehér, F. (Eds.) (1988). *The Postmodern Political Condition*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Holmes, M. (1984). The victory and failure of educational modernism. *Issues in Education*, II(1), 23-35.

Huberman, M. (1993). *The Lives of Teachers*. London: Cassell and New York: Teachers College Press.

Hultmann, G. & Horberg, C. (1993). *Teachers Informal Rationality: Understanding About Teachers Utilization of Knowledge*. Paper presented at the 6th ISATT Conference, Gothenburg, August.

Ingvarrson, L. (1992). *Educational Reform Through Restructuring Industrial Awards: A Study of the Advanced Skills Teacher*. Mimeograph, School of Education, Monash University, Melbourne.

Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in Classroons*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Jackson, P., Boostrom, R., & Hansen, D. (1993). *The Moral Life of Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Joas, H. (1993). *The Creativity of Action*. Paper presented to the Sixth Conference of the International Study Association of Teacher Thinking, Gothenburg.

Kanter, R. M., Stein, B. A. and Jick, J. D. (1992). *The Challenge of Organizational Change*. New York: The Free Press.

Labaree, D. (1992). Power, knowledge and the rationalization of teaching: A genealogy of the movement to professionalize teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(2).

Lacey, C. (1977). *The Socialization of Teachers*. London: Methuen.

Larson, S. M. (1980). Proletarianization and educated labor. *Theory and Society*, 9(1), 131-135.

Lasch, C. (1991). *The True and Only Heaven: Progress and Its Critics*. New York: W. W. Norton and Co.

Lasch, S. (1990). *Sociology of Postmodernism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Leinberger, P. & Tucker, B. (1991). *The New Individualists: The Generation After the Organization Man*. New York: Harper Collins.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. & Steinbach, R. (1993). *Sutton District High School: A Case Study of How One School Transformed Itself into an Oasis of Safety, Sanity and Stability*. Toronto: Centre for Leadership Development, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Lieberman, A., Darling-Hammond, L. & Zuckerman, D. (1991). *Early Lessons in Restructuring Schools*. New York: National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, Teachers and Teaching (NCRESTT).

Lieberman, A. and McLaughlin, M. (1992). Networks for educational change: Powerful and problematic. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73(9), 673-699.

Linblad, S. & Pérez, Prieto. H. (1992). School experiences and teacher socialization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 8(5/6), 465-470.

Liston, D. & Zeichner, K. (1991). *Teacher Education and the Social Conditions of Schooling*. New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall.

Liston, D. & Zeichner, K. (1990). Reflective teaching and action research in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 16(3), 235-254.

Little, J. W. (1993a). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15(2), 129-152.

Little, J. (1993b) Professional community in comprehensive high schools: The two worlds of academic and vocational teachers. In Little, J. and McLaughlin, M. (Eds.), *Teachers' Work: Individuals, Colleagues and Contexts*. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Little, J. W. (1990). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. *Teachers College Record*, 91(4), 509-536.

Little, J. W. (1987). Teachers as colleagues. In Richardson-Koehler, V. (Ed.), *Educators' Handbook*. White Plains: Longman, 491-510.

Little, J. W. & McLaughlin, M. (Eds.) (1993). *Teachers' Work: Individuals, Colleagues and Contexts*. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Louden, W. (1991). *Understanding Teaching*. London: Cassell and New York: Teachers' College Press.

Louis, K. S. & Miles, M. (1990). *Improving the Urban High School*. New York: Teachers' College Press.

MacDonald, M. (1991). Post-Fordism and the flexibility debate. *Studies in Political Economy*, **36**, Fall, 177-201.

McLaughlin, M. (1990). The Rand change agent study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. *Educational Researcher*, December, 11-16.

McLaughlin, M. & Talbert, J. (1993). *Contexts that Matter for Teaching and Learning*. Stanford University, CA: Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching.

McNeil, L. (1986). *Contradictions of Control: School Structure and School Knowledge*. New York: Routledge Kegan Paul.

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Metz, M. (1990). How social class differences shape teachers work. In McLaughlin, M., Talbert, J. E. and Bascia, N. (Eds.), *The Contexts of Teaching in Secondary Schools*. New York: Teachers' College Press, 40-107.

Montandon, C. (1992). La socialisation des émotions: un champ nouveau pour la sociologie de l'education. *Revue Francaise de Pedagogie*, **101**, Octobre-Novembre-Décembre, 105-122.

Neufeld, J. (1991). Curriculum reform and the time of care. *Curriculum Journal*, **2**(3), 285-300.

Nias, J. (1989). *Primary Teachers Talking*. London: Routledge.

Nias, J., Southworth, G. & Campbell, P. (1992). *Whole School Curriculum Development in the Primary School*. London and Washington: Falmer Press.

Nias, J., Southworth, G. & Yeomans, A. (1989). *Staff Relationships in the Primary School*. London: Cassell.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The Challenge to Care in Schools*. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Oakes, J. (1992). *Restructuring the Opportunity Structure: Detracking Schools*. Paper presented to International Conference on Restructuring Education: Choices and Challenges, Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Oberg, A. & Underwood, S. (1992). Facilitating teacher self-development: Reflections on experience. In Hargreaves, A. and Fullan, M. (Eds.), *Understanding Teacher Development*. London: Cassell and New York: Teachers' College Press.

Olson, J. (1991). *Understanding Teaching: Beyond Expertise*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal Knowledge*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Pollard, A. (1987). Primary teachers and their colleagues. In Delamont, S. (Ed.), *The Primary School Teacher*. London and New York: Falmer Press.

Pollard, A. (1982). A model of coping strategies. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 3(1), 19-37.

Pollard, A. & Tann, S. (1988). *Reflective Teaching in the Primary School*. London: Cassell.

Pratt, D. (1983). Curriculum for the 21st century. *Education Canada*, Winter, 41-47.

Reich, R. B. (1992). *The Work of Nations*. New York: Random House.

Riseborough, G. F. (1981). Teacher careers and comprehensive schooling: An empirical study. *Sociology*, **15**(3), 352-381.

Robertson, H-J. (1992). Teacher development and gender equity. In Hargreaves, A. and Fullan, M. (Eds.), *Understanding Teacher Development*. London: Cassell and New York: Teachers' College Press, 43-61.

Robertson, S. (1993). *Teachers' Labour and Post-Fordism: An Exploratory Analysis*. Deakin: Deakin University Press.

Rosenholtz, S. (1989). *Teachers' Workplace: The Social Organization of Schools*. New York: Longman.

Rudduck, J. (1991). *Innovation and Change*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Salzberger-Wittenberg, I. et al. (1983). *The Emotional Experience of Teaching and Learning*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Saul, J. (1992). *Voltaire's Bastards: The Dictatorship of Reason in the West*. Macmillan, The Free Press.

Schlechty, P. (1990). *Schools for the Twenty-First Century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schön, D. (1987). *The Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schwab, J. (1971). The practical: Arts of eclectic. *School Review*, **79**, 493-542.

Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline*. New York: Doubleday.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, **57**, 1-22.

Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, **57**, 4-14.

Sikes, P., Measor, L. and Woods, P. *Teacher Careers: Crises and Continuities*. London: Falmer Press.

Siskin, L. (1993). *Realms of Knowledge*. London and New York: Falmer Press.

Slavin, R. E. (1988). Cooperative learning and student achievement. *Educational Leadership*, **46**(2), 31-33.

Smyth, J. (Ed.) (1994). *Critical Discourses in Teacher Development*. London: Cassell.

Smyth, J. (Ed.) (1993). *The Socially Critical Self-Managing School*. London and New York: Falmer Press.

Smyth, J. (1991). International perspectives on teacher collegiality: A labour process discussion based on the concept of teachers' work. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, **12**(3), 323-346.

Soja, E. (1989). *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. New York: Verso.

Sugrue, K. (1993). *Confronting student teachers' lay theories and culturally embedded images of teaching: Implications for teacher education and research*. Paper presented to the International Invitational Symposium on Educational Research, St. Patrick's College, Dublin.

Swap, S. M. (1993). *Developing Home-School Partnerships: From Concept to Practice*. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Taafaki, I. (1992). *Collegiality and women teachers in elementary and middle school settings: The caring relationship and nurturing interdependence*, Doctor of Education Thesis, University of Massachusetts.

Tickle, L. (1991). New teachers and the emotions of learning teaching. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 21(3), 319-329.

Toffler, A. (1990). *Powershift*. New York: Bantam Books.

Tom, A. (1984). *Teaching as a Moral Craft*. New York: Longman.

Toulmin, S. (1990). *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*. New York: Free Press.

Troyna, B. (1993). *Deracialized Teachers*. Paper presented to the Sixth Conference of the International Study Association of Teacher Thinking (ISATT), Gothenburg, Sweden, September.

Waller, W. (1932). *The Sociology of Teaching*. New York: Wiley.

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York: Free Press.

Werner, W. (1988). Program implementation and experienced time. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, **XXXIV**(2), 90-108.

Woods, P. (1993). *The Charisma of the Critical Other: Enhancing the Role of the Teacher*. Paper given at the Sixth Conference of the International Study Association of Teacher Thinking, Gothenburg, August 10-15.

Woods, P. (1992). Symbolic interactionism: Theory and method. In LeComptes, M., Millroy, W. & Preissle, J. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*, Academic Press.

Woods, P. (1990). *Teacher Skills and Strategies*. London and New York: Falmer Press.

Woods, P. (1990). Teaching and creativity. In *Teacher Skills and Strategies*. London and New York: Falmer Press.

Woods, P. (1983). *Sociology and the School*. London: Routledge.

Woods, P. (1981). Strategies commitment and identity: Making and breaking the teacher role. In Barton, L. and Walker, S. (Eds.), *Schools, Teachers and Teaching*. Lewes: Falmer Press.

Woods, P. (1979). *The Divided School*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Woods, P. (1977). Teaching for survival. In Woods, P. and Hammersley, M. (Eds.), *School Experience*. London: Croom Helm.

Zeichner, K. (1991). *Conceptions of Reflective Teaching in Contemporary U.S. Teacher Education Program Reforms*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April.